

# The Philanthropist

PUBLISHED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE OHIO STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

GAMALIEL BAILEY, Jr., Editor.

We are verily guilty concerning our brother . . . . . therefore is this distress come upon us.

SAMUEL A. ALLEY, Printer.

VOLUME I. NO. 25. NEW SERIES.

CINCINNATI, TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1838.

WHOLE NO. 124.

## THE PHILANTHROPIST,

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,  
N. W. corner of Main & Sixth streets,  
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

JAMES BOYLE, Publishing Agent.

TERMS.—Two Dollars and fifty cents in advance.—  
Three Dollars if not paid till the expiration of the year. Let-  
ters on business should be directed to the Publishing Agent,  
those relating to the editorial department, to the Editor.  
In all cases post paid.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Philanthropist.

### SPEECH OF REV. J. BLANCHARD.

At the Anti-Slavery Anniversary, in Granville, Ohio,  
May 30, 1838.

Dr. BAILEY, I have complied with the request of many of the delegates to the Anniversary of the Ohio A. S. Society, in writing out the substance, and all I can recollect of the language of the remarks to which they so indulgently listened on the above occasion. As I had no notes except what I prepared in pencil, while listening to the important remarks of Rev. Mr. Rankin, who spoke on that evening, and as I left those in the desk where I stood, I have had to rely entirely on my memory for the substance and form of the speech: but I think those who heard me, will find here all the argument, and much of the language precisely the same as I then used.

J. B.

Resolved, that the property-holding power, by which every master holds his slave, is a sin in itself, and ought to be so treated by all Christians.

Mr. PRESIDENT, Ladies and Gentlemen.—Though unused to make excuses, it is due to my subject, my audience, and myself, merely to state to some of the embarrassments under which I am called to speak to this resolution, which, since I came into the house this evening, I have been requested to write and sustain. They are the long and fatiguing walk by which, covered with sweat and dust, I arrived in your village scarce two hours ago; after a tedious journey of some hundred and forty miles by stages: a somewhat severe cold, caught by exposure on the way; and that peculiar depression of feeling, arising from several nights last past, of brief and broken rest.

But, waving these, there are impediments which inhere in the substance of the resolution and the nature of the subject. One laborers under the same embarrassment when he attempts to prove the property-holding of man by man to be a sin, as he who undertakes to show, by argument, that snow is snow, that water is water, or that light is light.

But this difficulty is slight compared to that presented by the subject itself. Were I to speak on almost any other topic, I should not despair of listeners. If I were addressing you, sir, in your former judicial capacity, in behalf of a miserable culprit in the prisoner's box, charged with the crime of murder, every ear and mind and heart would be open to catch every circumstance, and retain every argument, in disproof or in mitigation of his guilt. But because I plead the cause of some millions of innocent people, unaccused of crime, yet chained and manacled and on trial for the worst form of imprisonment for life; bitter experience forces me to fear, that there may be hearts, even in this assembly, barred and bolted against whatever may be urged in their behalf!

Or, if my object was a Seminary or an Asylum, and my theme the intellectual wants of females, or the sorrows of widows and orphans, O, how promptly would your funds flow for the dissemination of science among the future mothers of this western world, and your tears fall with your contributions to cheer the gloom of the desolate, and soothe the sorrows of the bereft! But, alas! when I speak for females, in whom the fires of intellect have been trodden out by the iron hoofs of oppression; while I plead for parents whose husbands live! and in behalf of orphans whose parents live! I shame to remember that many in our land; nay, it may be, some in this house will listen to the appeal with an averted eye, a lip of scorn, and a heart of stone! Interest and avarice and honor, go where they will, are sure of a respectful hearing; but alas! Humanity has no bribes. And when she comes from the fields of suffering and outrage, to urge her claims upon the selfish and obdurate human heart, with her naked bosom all bleeding and torn by the thorns and briars of human wrong; the most she can hope for, is to be tolerated as an unwelcome intruder, and dismissed with respectful contempt! But no, I will not believe it. I will not believe there is one that hears me with heart so callous to the feelings of Humanity, and ear so deaf to her cry, as not to be reached by her arguments, and overcome by truth when uttered in her behalf.

Sir, this resolution affirms the inherent sinfulness of the property-holding of men, and the duty of all Christians to regard and treat the practice according to its nature. This is the Alpha and Omega of the Abolitionist's creed. If this single principle—that holding or regarding human flesh as property is sin, be once admitted, all the rest will follow. It is to the dissemination of this principle he has pledged himself; for this he has suffered what in the Providence of God he has been called to suffer; and for this he stands prepared to meet what he may yet have to endure. He means to cease neither from his prayers nor efforts till all sanction of this odious principle of human flesh-holding is wiped out from all books of morals, and all codes of law, and all societies of men; thus introducing a new fundamental maxim into the science of morals, of law, and of life.

Let us be distinctly understood. We hold that there are but two classes of human relations, the sinful and the pure, the holy and unholy, the natural and the false. We hold that all right social relations are marriage, parentage, obligations in business, partnerships in trade, of the employer and the employed, &c., are good and pure, because they are called for by the wants of our nature, and sanctioned by the word of God. But that all that class of fictitious and unnatural relations, concubinage, false parentage, as of Gipsies to their stolen children, (I protest against being understood as intending any thing disrespectful to our Southern brethren in the ministry, who take and keep the children of colored people,) the joint concern of counterfeiters, and the mutual obligations of smugglers and thieves—we say these are wrong, and ought immediately to be broken up, solely on the ground that they have no foundation in the wants of man, and no warrant in the word of God. And the point we make is just this, that the relation created by the property-holding power belongs to this last class of unnatural and unjustifiable relations, and therefore, like them, ought immediately and forever to cease.

For we hold that any restraint upon a man's soul, not demanded by the laws of his nature, or the conditions of his existence, is, in itself, an intolerable grievance. No matter whether one wishes to use his liberty or not; no man, no legislature has a right to put him under duress without just cause, and giving an equivalent. The public, even, has no right to curtail our natural right of locomotion while we are unaccused of crime against society on any other terms. It has no right to put up its edict at the entrance of a bridge.

\* Hon. Leicester King, of the Ohio Senate, formerly Judge King.

bidding us "Turn to the right as the law directs." but that it compensates the abridgment of our natural liberty, with the privilege of passing over dry shod. A man easily wears the ties imposed on him by the relations of husband, father, friend and citizen; but unnatural restriction is as galling to the soul as chains to the body. And the scars of the soul, like those on the body, never wear out. I may never wish to go to China, but let no man, let no body of men, forbid my going thither till I forfeit my freedom by crime.

It is somewhere said, that a man had lived seventy or eighty years, without once leaving the ward of the city where he was born—almost never leaving the little shop where he kept. The Emperor, struck with the fact, for the sake of the experiment, forbade, by an edict, his leaving his native ward on pain of death. This brought the old man tottering to the feet of the Emperor, imploring him to take off that cruel injunction; and declaring that he had not had a moment's rest since it came to his ears! Had the old man been left alone, no command was necessary to confine him to his ward; nay even to fasten him to his scanty shop. But if you invade, by unnatural impositions, the domain of the freedom of the soul, you dry up the fountains of its enjoyment, and doom the contented spirit to the ceaseless pining, the wo-truck restlessness of the maniac, or the quiet insensibility of the brute.

Such being our cardinal principle, set forth in the resolution I hold; you, sir, and this intelligent audience, will forgive my arduous, in supposing that your common-sense must have anticipated my argument and settled this question in advance.

If two men were alone on the earth, it is level to the mean, not comprehension, that nothing could justify one in laying hold of the other as his property, which would not also justify that one in holding him. The wood, the water, the herb, the fruit, the inferior animal, and the earth itself, he might appropriate to himself. They may become property. But if one man, may by any means, acquire a property power over another, the one thus holden, may himself own a third, he again a fourth, and this one a fifth, the fifth a sixth, and a sixth might get possession of the first; and it might thus come to pass that God should not be left in proprietorship of a man he has made! strip of his right to require his worship, to command his services, or dispose of one single hour of his time.

Sir, the common sense of mankind has decided this question in all things respecting themselves, or the persons of their friends. They shrink from the property-holding power as the ancient shrank from that wand, whose touch transformed men into swine. If the human body was ever meant for a commodity, it is most assuredly right to treat it as such when it becomes a carcass; and to subserve the purposes of science and public health. But no sooner does a resurrectionist rifle a grave, and convert the dead into property for the benefit of the living, than the whole neighborhood is in an uproar. What else mean the dead-houses which I observe in your grave-yards, near every school of medical lectures? Are they not placed there to proclaim to the world the impropriety of driving a traffic, even in the forsaken bodies, the mere cast-off shells of the souls? And having thus decided, do we want argument to prove you the sin, of taking that human body while every part is instinct and beating with life—the heart in it gushing with the same yearning tenderness to husband, wife, father, mother, son, daughter and friend, which thrills in yours—the bosom heaving with the same immortal hopes and fears, which throbs in yours; converting it into a chattel to be hawked and sold to the highest bidder? Forbid it reason! Forbid it Thou Most Merciful God! Nature and reason and sense and sensation cry out in its sin! SIN!! SIN!!

But I forget. I have undertaken to prove the doctrine of the resolution—not to assume it. And I shall attempt to do this by exhibiting the effect of this property-holding power on the MASTER, the SLAVE, and the COMMUNITY.

1. The exercise of just and legitimate power, does not necessarily deprave the one that wields it; but unnatural, improper, or usurped authority always freezes the affections and petrifies the heart. And the injury done by slavery to the slave-holder, shows that slave-holding is a sin of the first degree of enormity. It cuts him off from those offices of good neighborhood, and that feeling of mutual obligation which are necessary to check what is tyrannical, and subdue what is malevolent in man. His daily walk being among people whom he deems, his social feelings towards them must be repressed, and his own nature constantly violated; and as every pure and generous emotion becomes foul when stifled and stagnant, his feelings of ordinary kindness will burst out in irregular generosity, towards, perhaps, unworthy objects, while the daily tenor of his emotions is nothing but the dead selfishness of a tyrant.

The property power, vast, and from its nature uncertain, the master is situated like the religious despot, whose fear of losing his horrid ascendancy over men's souls, makes him torture their bodies. But the slave-holder's temptations to cruelty are stronger than the inquirer's in this: that the Priest, superintending his victim upon the rack, generally supposes God has authorized his horrid functions; while the slave-holder, especially the American slave-holder, is goaded to pendency by the consciousness that he has usurped the dreadful authority which he holds. The Bible and Declaration of Independence, will not let him deceive himself into the belief that he is doing right; and thus that uncertainty which makes the inquirer cruel, is, in his breast, aggravated by that conscious guilt which haunts the pillow of the Usurper. Nor is this all. As his authority is unlimited and his subjects few, he will possess the habits and inclinations of an absolute monarch, without his means to satisfy the demands of debauchery and ambition. And as the tyrants of petty states are ever most tyrannical, being driven to the exactions of avarice by the practice of prodigality, the slave-holder's condition unites the very worst circumstances which endanger the virtue of the Religious Inquirer, the Tyrant Usurper, and the legal King.

Sir, with all these influences festering in his soul; why should he not be haughty, and jealous, and cruel? Is he not a man? If his prey be human bodies, why should he not possess the fierce and remorseless passions of the Vulture, and (among his people) the retired and haughty manners of the hawk. I say not that such is the slave-holder's character, but such is the nature of his condition. Such the property-power. And I aver against the Universe, ever in the fear of his God, that a power which subjects the holder to influences so dreadful, must involve an enormity of guilt which language can never reach. The Priest may soften when his prerogative is safe, the Usurper unbent when his crime is forgotten; and the King rest satisfied when his exchequer is full. But the wretch subjected to the alarms, the remorse and the vices which distract the three, can find no rest but in utter hardness of heart.

2. And now, sir, if the property-power be all this, and more, to the holders, what must it be to the slave? Having already spoken of the operation upon the soul, of unnatural restrictions, and impositions unfounded in the wants and necessities of man, I shall not dwell, (for I have not time) on the wholesale havoc which this power makes of the humanity of the slave. But only express my astonishment, in passing, that sensible men can ever speak of a human creature being "well used," while under this property power; a condition which strips him of every immunity,

and tears every right he has, out of his soul. What do they mean to brand our revolutionary fathers as fools? A man, and yet "well used" while deprived of all his freedom! Not it is history that in robbing a man of his liberty, you destroy his industry, by depriving him of every motive to exertion which God meant should propel human machinery—hope, of friends, of character, of reward; and you destroy all his virtue, by making it of no earthly use to him not to be vicious. Hence the character of the slave has been one in all countries, and ages; under all climates and complexions, and the fundamental principle of that character—the true ends of his being, are—to eat all he can—waste all he can—and work what he must.

3. But the inherent sinfulness of holding men as property will, if possible, more clearly appear, by viewing its effects on the community.

The Marquis Beccaria, in his learned and judicious treatise on crimes, graduates the guilt of all mal-practices by the harm done to society: those occupying the highest grade, which tend to subvert society altogether by destroying fundamental morality.

To make his doctrine plain, take the case of theft.

Now if it had always been fashionable to steal, and the practice were in the hands of none but gentlemen, and were regulated by salutary rules—if nothing was taken but from men worth, at least fifty thousand dollars, and much of the proceeds of the business was regularly distributed in Bibles and bread to the poor; it would be exceedingly difficult to convince the people that theft was so very bad. Much harder would it be to persuade them in the teeth of their fixed habits of thought and against all their pre-conceived notions that stealing was the heinous thing it is now viewed. To be sure the practice presses a little on the Bible views of justice and equality between man and man: but then what of all that you would be more likely to make things worse than better by attempting a change.

Beccaria would reply, "It is true the practice is somewhat restrained, and the thieves are amiable, at times liberal, and always gentlemen. Nevertheless stealing is a high crime, because, if carried out, it will subvert all human society. It is the nature of all wrong practices to make their perpetrators worse. And though now gentlemen steal only from fifty thousand dollar property, they will, by the fixed and known laws of nature, become less scrupulous the longer they steal. Shortly they will not weigh a man's rent-roll before they lift his purse; and if they should ever fall into pressing want, (a case exceedingly liable to happen among thieves who usually spend as freely as they take,) they will be likely to steal the first thing they can reach, although it be a beggar's last shilling. And thus the practice of theft from the particularly gentlemanly well regulated custom must, in the event, become a general, vulgar, and utterly lawless habit. For it holds with the community as with an individual heart; let in one mother vice, it will hold open the door for the entrance of the whole brood."

Now, he might continue, "the moment stealing becomes general, society is overthrown. There can be no such thing as property. No grown cattle then; because you would rather take the calf than let some one else steal. If grown grown on an ox. No fruit would ripen then, for the boy who saw it with one side red, would sooner steal it than let somebody else have it when both cheeks were blushing. No land would be filled then: for why should I raise grain for another man to steal? No—nothing—I tire you by showing what you all perceive, that if the practice of theft once obtains in society, all its wheels must stop—all notions of right and wrong be confounded, and men sink into savages at once. Stealing is then a high crime, because it tends to overthrow society altogether."

A vice is an offence against the law of morals; a crime is done against society; a sin is a breach of the law of God.—This property holding power, is all three; and if I show that it is a vice, or, (what I am about to do,) a high crime, both the one and the other is a sin against God. For all crime is sin, but every sin is not necessarily, and in legal sense, a crime.

Now as "sin when it is perfected, bringeth forth death," so this property power, when it reaches its natural growth, "bringeth forth the death" of society. And it does this with far more certainty, and attended with far more disgusting circumstances than stealing in accomplishing the same end.

When the first Africans were landed from a Portuguese vessel upon our shores, and sold into separate families, it was difficult to show why the arrangement was not salutary. The slaves would be safely taught because they were few and labor would not, immediately, become a disgrace in the provinces, because others besides themselves would be compelled to work. But by known and revolting laws of such society the slave increase always outruns the free, and when slaves become numerous they must be kept ignorant or they cannot be kept at it. They will write themselves passes and run away, or they will conspire together and rebel. No free woman or man will then tend to work, because they will at once be classed with slaves. Every child must follow the condition of the mother, and as it is expensive to raise children where living is high, almost all the mothers will be slaves. Idleness plunges the free population into vice; vice makes them effeminate; effeminate makes them weak; weakness makes them fearful; fear makes them cruel to the slaves. "All this, while the slave population grows more numerous, less human and more remorseless. Every blow laid upon his back, if it does not take life, hardens his muscle and steals his heart. The pent up wrongs and insults of ages, burn in his blood, and the serpents of revenge lie twisted around his arm. And when they come to know, (and they will know) their superiority of numbers and strength, "the end of these things is nigh."

Now from this slight inspection of slavery, who does not see that it tends, and tends directly and powerfully, to the utter subversion, the complete overthrow of all society? And if we apply the established test and estimate the degree of criminality there is in the property holding power by the injury it does to society, who but must see at once, that there is no practice forbidden in the penal code, murder itself not excepted, which can lay claim to a higher grade? Unpunished murder can do no more: slave holding surely does no less than tend to overthrow all society.

Sir, having wearied myself, probably tired the patience of you all, I might perhaps stop here. But I wish to meet the objector to our doctrine for a few moments upon his own ground. I never yet saw the man, at the North or South, who would not condemn many things about slavery. The clerical slaveholder piously regrets his concubinage. The gentlemanly planter mourns, perhaps swears at the savagery of his overseer. The overseer curses the inefficiency of the driver; and both blaspheme God on account of the gentlemanly planter who pockets the proceeds of unpaid toil; and strange to tell, the slave trader, he who ministers to them all, without whom their business would fall at once, is often excused by them all. As in a lunatic Asylum, each sees that the other is wrong.

And if we were to judge of slavery by the testimony of its servants, we must set it down as a villainous business throughout.

But, differing in all else, there is one point in which all our opponents, North and South, from the Pulpit to the Quarter, agree. They say that in certain circumstances a man may

hold slaves and not sin—i. e. The naked property holding power, is not in itself, sinful.

Now, Sir, admit the sinfulness of the property power, and I will take up and justify all the details of slavery; which these gentlemen so laud themselves for condemning. Take for granted, one moment, that the property power is not sinful in itself and see how many conclusions this draws after it.

If the property power be not sinful, then it is right to take the slave's earnings without paying him wages.

I know that the Bible, and reason, and nature, have been held to sanction and almost sanctify the wages principle. I know that the Bible "Woe to him that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work," has not been deemed against mercy and justice, and the heart of the human race has responded to, "The laborer is worthy of his hire." You all know how the feelings of the country have been roused, when, by the old Embargo law, and other violent fluctuations in the political and mercantile world, thousands of hands willing to work, could get no wages for their labor—when the haunts of busy industry were the silence of the grave. When along the wharves in our cities, in the shops of our citizens, by the anvil or the workbench, no cheerful sound of the hammer gave promise to the young family that their returning wants would be supplied; and the young mother arose in the morning and brought to the shutters to keep the hated light from waking her babes, lest their early prayers, "Our Father give us this day our daily bread," should drive her frantic because there was no bread to give them.

It does seem hard when the hand that toils receives no wages to keep the heart beating while it delves the soil or piles the mechanic toil! But sir, it is not hard. It is right: perfectly right: if the property power be not sinful, why pay property, wages? Will you give wages to your horse or dog? Will you give a man the property power over his fellow beings and then tell him he ought to pay them wages? You insult his understanding, and mock him in his face. Do you not know that wages cuts up the relation of such property wherever it touches it? If it is right to own a man, it is most surely right to use him as property. And the man who says this property power is not sinful, and yet contends for compensation to the slave, must either not know what he does mean or else mean to treat the subject deceptively.

2. Many also complain that the slave is by law forbidden to read the Bible. But it is right—perfectly right so to forbid him. If they were taught to read they could not be held as property. And why insult a man by giving him the property power and annexing a condition which annihilates its value? What slaveholder would thank his most subservient Northern apologist for such a boon as this? You all know that if the slaves had learning they could not be kept in slavery. They would write themselves papers and run away.—They would correspond with each other and rebel. They would free themselves by the rational ascendancy of an educated mind in a laborious body over those effeminate by idleness and vice. If their naked act of holding them as property be not sinful, it is right to keep them in ignorance.

3. Others complain of the separations of husband and wife, depriving the parent of the rule over her child &c.—But if you allow slaves the benefit of these relations, they in large part cease to be property. Why, would you allow cattle and horses power over their own young? If the property-holding power be not sinful, then it would be wrong to set up any claim in behalf of the slave, to give him the right to his wife or child. You just so far invade and annihilate the chattel principle, as you invest them with these rights.

4. So also the flogging, which creates such a sensation, is right and proper; if the tenure by which the master holds is sinful. What else will you do with an animal which is refractory but whip him till he yields? There is no other motive which can reach a slave, but the lash, and no principle to which the owner can appeal but the fear of pain. Take away this, and not a hoe would be lifted throughout the South. Even on the plantations where the slaves have received kind usage; and no flogging has been done for years; (cases few and far between) even there the slaves would not work for nothing one day longer if they knew they should not be flogged for refusing. No human creature on earth would do it. Fear, the only impelling motive being taken away, not a limb would move. If it is not sinful to own, then it is right to flog them if they are refractory or idle.

5. More than all. It is perfectly right in certain cases to murder them. I know this may sound startling, but it is perfectly true, perfectly defensible.

What will you do with an incurably vicious animal which causes more trouble than he is worth? What will you do with the way? Now an incorrigible slave endangers the subordination of the whole gang. He destroys all their value as property; waiving the dangers of the owners or overseer's life, which is constantly exposed when there is one slave who refuses to be whipped or to obey. It is as absurd to think of imprisoning all vicious slaves, as of doing the same with unruly horses. They would relish the cold sleep of the dungeon so much better than the hot sun and the drivers, whips, that the entire soil must be covered with jails to receive them. What else remains? Why just this—kill them. This is the only true policy; and it is right—murder is perfectly right, if it be not sinful to hold men as property. Let no man be guilty of the enormity of saying this property-holding power is not sinful, till he is prepared to underwrite the unutterable blasphemies of slavery's code; and endorse the whole catalogue of its bloody abominations! It is rank mockery!

And now, sir, I have done. If I have established the proposition that "the property-holding power, by which every master keeps his slave, is sinful in itself," then it follows that we are answerable to God and the world, if we shrink from treating this practice according to its nature.—It will, it must, sooner or later find its own natural level; and sink to the fellowship of kindred practices. Its weight is sufficient to drag down the reputation, and overwhelm with disgrace any combination in church or state which shall seek to uphold it. Let us then, declare to the world its true nature, and set upon the truth of our declaration. Let us do what we can to hasten its expulsion from the church, its utter extermination from the country and from the world. And the star of hope, which has led mankind through the bewildered travel of nearly six thousand years shall again become stationary in our own skies, and point out our own land to the admiring gaze of surrounding nations! (The resolution was unanimously adopted.)

## ANTI-SLAVERY.

LETTER OF HON. THOMAS MORRIS.

WASHINGTON, May 11th, 1838.

Gentlemen—I have seen in the Pennsylvania Freeman of the 3d inst, with sensations of the deepest gratitude, the favorable notice you have been pleased to take of my name in your general invitation to the public to attend the opening of the Pennsylvania Hall on the fourteenth of the present

month, which Hall, I understand, is to be dedicated to free discussion.

It would afford me the highest pleasure to be present and join you in this work of universal charity and love, could I feel that my public duties as well as my health would justify it—domestic concerns having lately called me to Ohio, I have but just resumed my seat here; it seems proper, therefore, that I should not willingly at this time absent myself from the Senate.

Your Hall, as I have said, is to be dedicated to free discussion. What train of solemn reflections does the very thought create in the mind. Is it possible, that in the free state of Pennsylvania, (a city not inappellably called the city of "brotherly love," that in all places, and at all times, free discussion on all questions connected with the religion, morality, the welfare of the country, or the rights of man, cannot be had with safety to the citizen, and the peace and quiet of the community? I presume this cannot be the case in your city, and was not the great moving cause that induced your humane, philanthropic, and patriotic citizens to erect the Hall which they are about to open.

If, however, Pennsylvania is safe, if Philadelphia is secure from all attempts to put down the right of free discussion, the liberty of speech, and the press, your fellow citizens have seen and felt that all parts of our beloved country are not thus highly favored. It is gratifying indeed, that while the Enemy of human rights and constitutional liberty is, in our country, making rapid advances to power, endeavoring as far as in him lies, not only to silence discussion, but even to muzzle the press itself, knowing that his principles cannot stand the test of examination, Philadelphia has the honor to erect a barrier which he cannot pass, and a battery which cannot silence, but which will effectually destroy his whole power, by the consecration of a spot where all his pretensions may be fully and fairly discussed.

This act of your citizens I regard not as a local act merely. It is not for Philadelphia alone to receive its benefits, but the whole country—the whole world. Its objects are universal and impartial justice to all men in every condition, to establish each in his own inherent, individual, and unalienable rights, to give warning of approaching danger, and stay the rod of the oppressor; and as such, we claim for the day of consecration a bright page in the history of our country.

Every philanthropist, every moralist must mourn and deplore the riots, burnings, and murders, that of late have taken place in our country. Your own recollections will be sufficient to place before your minds scenes of the most outrageous atrocity.—How often have tidings of the destruction of the press, because it has spoken fearlessly in defence of human rights, tingled in your ears? Have you not heard that free born AMERICAN CITIZENS have been, by a lawless mob, subjected to the infamous torture of the WHIP? Has not the weapon of the assassin laid its victim bleeding at his feet, for no crime, for no act but that which you intend to practice in the Hall you have erected—the exercise of the right of FREE DISCUSSION. While I rejoice that your citizens are embodying themselves to march forward to the rescue, I mourn for my country that this same felt spirit which has urged mobs, not only of the "baser sort," but of citizens who claim to be respectable, to deeds of violence and blood, has found its way in some degree into the councils and official stations of the country, into the bosom of society, and I much fear into the very PURPLE itself, thus rendering insecure all that is dear and sacred to man.

I would willingly draw a veil over the proceedings of that body, of which I have the honor to be a member, in regard to the important right of free discussion, if the deep sense of the obligations of duty which I feel to you and the country would permit me to do so. This same spirit which you are about so nobly to rebuke has been able, in the very halls of Congress, to silence debate at its pleasure. It has been able to strike its deadly fangs, into the most vital part of American liberty. It has denied the right of petition, in all its essential qualities, to a large portion of our fellow citizens on a subject they deemed worthy of their highest consideration, and materially affecting the honor and interest of our country. If it were possible, I would that I could persuade myself not to believe this, but while the records of our country bear witness to the fact, it cannot be. I fervently pray that the fear of some Recording Angel may yet be dropped upon the words of shame and dishonor, and blot them out for ever.

If the supreme Legislature of the country can rightfully in any one possible instance, refuse to receive, hear, and act upon petitions sent by any portion of the human race who are subject to our laws, or owe allegiance to our government, I can see no safe guarantee for this high privilege in any case whatever, when it shall come in contact with power, interest, or influence. For if an individual right which was deemed of a character too sacred to be regulated or controlled by the people themselves, by their highest fundamental law, (the Constitution,) and placed by that instrument above the power of Congress to ABRIDGE, can be withheld or restrained by that body, it is hard to discover what political or natural right you, or I, or any other citizen can calculate upon as secure. If the right of petition fail us, will it not prove that the whole fabric of the Constitution is rotten and not worth our care; its preservation in such case for any valuable purpose might well be considered doubtful.

It is not only the right of petition that has been abridged. The freedom of debate has been stricken down, and lies dead in the halls of Congress. We are compelled to submit not only to a rule which imposes silence on a question to lay a majority on proposition on the table, and which a majority can always use to put an end to discussion disagreeable to them, however important it may be to others; but the country now mourns the loss of one of her most talented sons, whose life it is believed was sacrificed for the exercise of the right of free discussion in the very hall of Congress itself. It would be some consolation if, in the midst of this war upon individual rights, this want of personal security, this waste of political privileges in the chambers of legislation, the judiciary of the country remained firm and uncontaminated. But here we have also to deplore, that the incendiary with the torch in his hand, scarcely extinguished, with which he had attempted to fire his neighbor's dwelling, because of that neighbor's exercise of his unquestionable right in the free expression of his opinion; and the mobocrat who has attempted to silence the press by its destruction, together with the assassin whose red hands are yet dripping with the blood of his innocent victim, find not only protection but favor;—and this new code of morals which would impose restraint upon the

expression of our thoughts because the truth may affect some pecuniary interest, or expose some wicked practice, teaches the doctrine that a printing press may be broken up, a man's house may be burned, and the owner slain by violence, and yet no one be guilty! It has been said, and I think truly, that the verdicts of juries give the character of a country. What then will be the character of our country before an impartial world, if juries shall continue to lend themselves to this same spirit of misrule, and violence, and blood?

But if we withdraw our views from the constituted authorities of the land, from men in official stations, and extend it over the country at large, what do we behold? The Bowie-knife and the pistol substituted for reason and argument, usurping the power of the laws, or setting them at defiance,—the actors professing to draw the example from high places of power, and justifying themselves by the actions of men who claim to be among the most respectable citizens. It is against the freedom of speech, the right of free discussion, that these ruffians in society wage their fiercest war.

I am aware that it may be thought that I have written hard things against my fellow citizens; but do not the facts that exist justify me? And should I not be faithful, indeed, and recreant to all my principles, if, when writing to you on the important event which you are about to celebrate, I should either fail or fear to express my thoughts fully and freely? If I did not do so, I might well be considered a mocker of the institutions I profess to honor. The picture I have presented, I know is one not calculated to flatter our vanity; but it is no fancy-sketch—it has all the painful vividness of reality.

We should ponder on the signs of the times with serious deliberation. We have been and are still a prosperous and favored people; but I fear that in the eyes of Him in whose hands are our destinies, and who can search the heart, we are viewed as a proud and sinful nation. And if His chastisements have not already commenced, our wickedness, without repentance, must call them down at last.

To understand our errors, and know the evil that besets us, is the first step towards reformation. To examine into, and ascertain the causes which have produced these evils, is necessary to their radical cure. This examination I shall now attempt. There is implanted in our very nature a love of power and dominion, no doubt for wise and beneficial purposes, but dominion in the creation of man was only given him over "the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, the cattle, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the face of the earth." It was never intended by the Creator, that man should have dominion over his fellow man, but by his full and free consent. Had this been intended, it would have been given when the boundaries of man's dominion were fixed and established. The exercise, then, of all power which subjects man to involuntary servitude, and to a dominion to which he has not given his full and free consent, is a violation of the laws of Heaven, and contrary to the very nature of man, who, though formed for dominion and imbued with his love, yet has authority from his Maker to exercise it only over inanimate matter, and over creatures not made in the awful image of God!

But when man became wicked and corrupt, he began to usurp dominion over his fellow man, reducing the weaker and less guarded portions of the race to the condition of the cattle of the field. This, however, could not totally destroy the principle of reason within the immortal creature thus degraded; he knew still that he was entitled to the same rights as his fellow man, and that his condition was the effect of gross injustice and grinding oppression. This produced the constant strife between the oppressed and the oppressor, the fruitful source of violence and crime through all time, and created the desire and stimulated the action of those in power to prevent, as far as possible, all examination into the rights of man as established by his Creator.

The exercise of dominion begat the love of ease and opulence. This could more readily be obtained by appropriating to his own use the labor of other without any just compensation therefor. Thus the love of money, the root of all evil, grew and expanded. In our own time and day, those principles which our fathers intended to subdue, and eradicate, if possible, in the formation of a Constitution founded upon the natural and unalienable rights of man, have sprouted afresh, with a luxuriance which is calculated to fill the mind of the just and good with deep and solemn reflection.

I have heard it asserted by a sagacious statesman of our own country, that it was one of the unchanged and unchangeable laws of Providence that one man should live upon the labor of another, that this always had and always would be the case, and that American slavery as it existed in the Southern States, was the best human modification of that unalterable decree. This was the language of a Southern gentleman, from a slaveholding state. The practical operation of this despotic system, of man as an individual usurping dominion over man, and endeavoring to live upon the labor of others, began in our country with the slaveholders, and its ramifications are now seen and felt in all parts of our country. The desire to live upon the unrequited labor of others is acquiring a dreadful universality. It is the slaveholding power,—this Goliath of all monopolies,—that now brandishes his spear and threatens the overthrow of our most essential rights, and the most sacred of all our privileges. It defies even the Constitution, itself, to engage in single combat. It claims to be before and superior to that instrument which it contends has acknowledged its superiority, and has guaranteed its existence and perpetual duration. It imperiously asserts that it has converted men into property; and as a matter of course, any person, when he becomes a citizen of the United States, has a right to the enjoyment and use of this species of property, in each and every state in the Union. It is upon this false position, that a person can be converted by law into a thing, that slavery rests its whole claim—a position at war with the Constitution of the United States, and which ought not to be sustained in our courts of justice. It is provided in the fourth article of the amendments to the Constitution, that the right of the PEOPLE to be secured in their persons against unwarrantable seizure shall not be violated; and that warrants when issued shall particularly describe the persons or things to be seized. I suggest, then, as the settled conviction of my own mind, that our courts of justice cannot rightfully adjudge that a negro slave is property, because he is not a thing, and property consists in things only. That he may be claimed







troty fifteen hundred dollars' worth of property—the property of a poor mechanic—and pitiful, very pitiful, that they should be called on to compensate him! Away with such sickening, sin-doving sympathy!

### INCREASE OF THE SLAVERY-SPIRIT.

June 1st, the bill to divide the territory of Wisconsin, and to establish the territorial government of Iowa, (west of the Mississippi,) was under discussion. Here is a glimpse at the proceedings.

"On motion of Mr. CLAY of Alabama, all but white males were expressly excluded from the right of suffrage under the bill."

"This simple circumstance tells volumes; it tells that prejudice against the colored man is one of the principles which regulate the policy of our national government, and that this government is under the controlling influence of slave-holders, ready, at their bidding, to violate the doctrine of equal rights. It is another evidence of the degeneracy of the American people, another evidence of the necessity of a reëlected public sentiment in the free states."

In the celebrated ordinance of '87, for the government of the northwestern territory, no restrictions were imposed on the rights of the colored people. They were not excluded from the right of suffrage nor were they rendered ineligible to office. The American people in those days, clearly understood and reverently loved the doctrine of human rights. They had not yet learned to esteem lightly those glorious principles which originated and sanctioned their own struggles for independence. To practice tyranny without a blush, was an accomplishment of which they could not boast, though it be one in which their posterity have no mean skill.

The ordinance provided that so soon as there should be five thousand free male (not white male) inhabitants, they should receive authority to elect representatives, &c. &c., provided that for every five hundred free male (not white male) inhabitants there should be one representative &c. The only restrictions in relation to eligibility to the legislature, were, "that no person be eligible or qualified to act as a representative, unless he shall have been a citizen of one of the United States three years, and be a resident in the district; or unless he shall have resided in the district three years; and in either case, shall hold in his own right, in fee simple, two hundred acres of land within the same." The restrictions on the right of suffrage were simply these: "A freehold in fifty acres of land in the district, having been a citizen of one of the States, and being resident in the district, or the like freehold, and two years, residence in the district, shall be necessary to qualify a man as an elector of a representative." The ordinance disfranchised no man on account of his color. The framers of the ordinance did not dare to do it. The moral sense of the republic would have revolted at the act as a mockery of those principles of liberty and equality which the heroes of the revolution had consecrated by their blood.

In 1838, feelings are changed, another interest predominates, other doctrines prevail, new views regulate the policy of the general government. A part of Wisconsin is divided off and erected into an independent territory, and congress resolves without discussion or division to impose such a restriction on the right of suffrage as is called for by the "peculiar institutions of the South."

It resolves that only free white males shall be admitted to the right of suffrage. Thus it is that the spirit of slavery is fed by concession.

**A GOOD MOVE.**—A zealous abolitionist writing from Logansport, Ia., says, "It, (the Philanthropist), is certainly the paper for the West, and my strong desire for its wider circulation impelled me to present before the Cass and the Carroll Co. meetings, a resolution recommending it to the patronage of the friends of abolitionism." We are obliged to our Indiana friend. There ought to be far more subscribers to our paper in that state. Will not abolitionists there take the matter into consideration and try what they can do to enlarge our subscription list and otherwise help us?

**MORGAN TOWNSHIP SOCIETY.**—An Anti-Slavery Society was formed in Morgan Township, Morgan Co. last Nov. 10th, numbering, 32 males, 20 females. Pres. James Cope—address Malta P. O.; Sec. James Smith.

### ABOLITION IN CONNECTICUT.

The rapidity with which the principles of abolition are pervading the public mind of Connecticut is astonishing. During the late session of the State Convention in New Haven, abolitionists had the privilege of speaking for themselves before two joint committees appointed by the Legislature.

We copy the following from the Emancipator:

In the afternoon and evening of Thursday, and on the morning of Friday, Mr. Birney was heard before two joint committees of the Legislature, in regard to striking the word "white" from their State Constitution, the repeal of the "Black Act," and all other laws which make distinctions on the account of color, for a jury trial to persons claimed as slaves, and for a protest against the "infamous resolution" of Dec. 21, passed by the House of Representatives of the United States. On these subjects, Mr. Birney spoke, about three hours, and in regard to the resolution of Mr. Patton, Mr. Colver addressed the appropriate committee about an hour.

Mr. Stanton addressed the committee to whom had been referred all petitions relating to the admission of new States and of Texas to the Union, and in regard to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and of the slave trade between the States, about six hours in all, at different times on Thursday, Friday and Saturday. The conduct of the committee was most interesting to any others held during the session, and the numerous questions propounded to the speakers by members of the committee, evinced not only their interest in the questions, but their willingness to aid them to the bottom. Large portions of the Legislature were present at these discussions.

Friday evening, Mr. Birney addressed a numerous audience at the Free church, developing the inequality of any results of Colonization or Gradualism, to remove slavery.

As a result of these meetings has been highly favorable to our cause. Many misapprehensions have been corrected, prejudices removed, and converts made. The impression upon the Legislature is said to be very favorable. Notices of the anti-slavery meetings at the Free church, were read from their seats, by the presiding officers of both Houses, Connecticut will yet be redeemed.

From the same paper we gather the following important particulars with regard to the action of the Connecticut Legislature:

### I. The Act for jury trial.

An abstract of this bill is given in the New Haven Herald, and the notes of the Hon. Seth P. Beers. So far as we can judge of its provisions, they appear to be sufficient to prevent any application to the courts for the surrender of fugitives under the state laws, or to state magistrates. A caution may occur with the federal courts, which will bring to the test the constitutionality of the law of Congress.

on the subject. We should like to hear Major Bullock recollect the passage of the act with its representations that the people of Connecticut are in favor of the slaveholders. The bill is judiciously entitled:

"An act for the fulfillment of the obligations of this state, imposed by the Constitution of the United States, in regard to persons held in service or labor in this state escaping into another; and to secure the rights of any person who may be held in service or labor in any state or territory of the United States shall escape into this state, the person entitled to his service may have a habeas corpus to bring him before a Judge or before the county or superior court, if in session, or if in a city before a city court. 2. The proof to obtain this writ shall be the affidavit of the applicant stating the facts, and the case, and if necessary adjourn the hearing, committing him to the custody of the Sheriff or taking bond for his appearance. 4. If requested by either party, the trial shall be by jury of 12 men. 5. If on trial the court or jury find that the claimant is not entitled to his services, they may discharge him from custody and award damages. If they find the applicant entitled to his service, the court shall grant a certificate to that effect, and allow him to take him back to the state where he belongs. 6. This certificate shall be sufficient authority to remove him through and out of the state. 7. The fees to be paid by the claimant. 8. No Justice or officer of this state shall grant any warrant or writ of five hundred dollars. 9. No person shall remove any such person from this state except as aforesaid on penalty of five hundred dollars."

If there is any defect in the bill, it is in not requiring of the claimant adequate security for the costs and damages in case he fails to make out his claim.

### II. The Canterbury black act.

Act to repeal an act therein named. Repeals the Canterbury negro law.

### III. Slavery and Texas.

The following resolutions on the subject of slavery and the annexation of Texas to the Union, passed both houses of the General Assembly:

State of Connecticut—General Assembly, May session, 1838.

Resolved, That we, the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened, do, in the name of the people of this state, solemnly protest against the annexation of Texas to this Union.

Resolved, That Congress has, by the constitution, power to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia and the territories.

Resolved, That it is the duty of Congress to exercise the same, as soon as it can be done consistently with the best good of the whole country.

Resolved, That his Excellency the Governor be requested to forward a copy of these resolutions to each of our senators and representatives in Congress.

### IV. Liberty of speech and right of petition.

The following resolutions on these subjects, reported by a joint committee, were passed by both houses of the General Assembly:

Whereas, the House of Representatives of the United States, did on the 21st day of December last, adopt the following resolution, to wit:

"Resolved, That all petitions, memorials, and papers touching the abolition of slavery, or the buying, selling, or conveying of slaves in any state, territory, or district of the United States, shall be laid on the table without reading, reference, or printing, and that no further action whatever should be had thereon." And whereas, the said resolution is a virtual denial of the right of petition, and also a denial of the freedom of debate; and whereas, in enforcing this resolution the said House of Representatives have infringed upon the rights of the people of this state, and of the people of the United States, we cannot consent to any interference with the rights of the people of this state.

Resolved, That we, the Senate and House of Representatives of the state of Connecticut, in General Assembly convened, do, in the name of the people of the state of Connecticut, condemn the usurpation of power, in violation of the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, subversive of the fundamental principles of free government, at war with the prerogatives of the people, and dangerous to the Union.

Resolved, That while we recognize the peculiar rights of our members of Congress, we cannot consent to any interference with the rights of the people of this state.

Resolved, That this assembly do hereby request the Representatives in Congress, from this state, to use their best exertions to cause the said resolution to be rescinded; and that his Excellency the Governor be requested to forward a copy of the foregoing preamble and resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, with a request that the same may be laid before that body.

It is remarkable that we do not find in the Connecticut records, political rights, the single of the state of these important movements in favor of liberty and human rights. The truth of the matter doubtless is, that the editors are as sound as the progress of public opinion, and dare not say what they think.

### INDIANA CONVENTION.

Responses to the call for a State Convention in Indiana, are continually coming in. We have just received 85 names more: we intend to publish them together with a part of the communication of friend Graves in the next number. Meanwhile let no Abolitionist in Indiana be idle. The time for working is short. In a little more than two months, the proper season for holding the convention will have arrived.

**THE SOUTH REQUIRES IT.**—One of the witnesses on the late trial of the rioters testified that, one of the Defendants in conversation with him had approved the destruction of the Philanthropist press, remarking that the "South required a demonstration of that kind!" The South required it! Exalted motive!

### A MISTAKE CORRECTED.

We are informed that we were mistaken in stating that Judge Wright was one of the counsel employed by the defendants in the Riot-trials.

### NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

The Liberator says—"The 5th annual meeting of this Convention was held in New York, commencing on Wednesday morning and closing its session on Friday evening—the interest in its proceedings steadily increasing up to the last moment. The venerable SERAUSO of Duxbury, father of Peleg Sprague of Boston, acted as presiding officer; and although seventy eight years of age, he discharged the duties of his station with a precision and promptness which were truly marvellous. No less than eight public meetings were held by the convention; at all of which he was constantly present, never once vacating the chair, excepting to address the house. No one entered into the proceedings with more freeness and spirit than himself, and it was delightful and animating to gaze on this time-honored and venerable old man. It was indeed, a rare, affecting and sublime spectacle. To think that this silver-haired philanthropist and christian, branded by the minions of slavery as a fanatic and incendiary, the enemy of the country and the Union—doomed to perish ignominiously, should be caught in the slave-holding rigors! Down with that bloody system!

It is concluded on all hands that the meetings of the Convention were more interesting than any others held during the anniversary week. The audiences were large and of the greatest respectability, intellectually and morally. An unusual number of Clergymen of all denominations, were in attendance—a significant and important sign of the times. The number of delegates and members was large—not less than five hundred, and comprising the bone and muscle of the anti-slavery of New England. Eleven States were represented. There were many spirited addresses made and strong resolutions adopted.

[We have room only for a few of the resolutions passed by this body.]

### POLITICAL ACTION.

The following resolutions on political action were offered by Alvan Stewart and sustained by him in a very able manner.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Convention, it is the solemn duty of every abolitionist in the land, to employ his political influence, whether in the primary meetings, the whole power or otherwise, to procure the nomination of such persons to Congress, as will go pledged to employ their whole power to abolish slavery wherever the power of Congress extends to that object.

Resolved, That while we deplore as most fatal to the success of the anti-slavery enterprise, the formation of any distinct anti-slavery political organization, still, in the opinion of this Convention, it is an important duty, demanded of us by the state laws, to go to the polls in all cases and vote, irrespective of party, for such and such only, who will promote the great cause of emancipation and human liberty, both in the State and national Legislatures.

### KIDNAPING AND PIRACY.

Whereas the Constitution of this State was ordained to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty to the inhabitants thereof; and whereas it confers no authority on

Congress to make one portion of the people the property of another portion, in any district or territory under its jurisdiction; and whereas, without any constitutional authority, and by a most fearful and daring usurpation of power, ruinous to the victims, dangerous to the liberties of every American citizen, and perilous to the liberties of the whole Union, the people of the United States have passed an act, hereinafter called the "Fugitive Slave Law," which authorizes the seizure of any person, who, by the Constitution are justly made free men, and entitled to liberty, as those who imposed, and now, by force and arms, continue upon them the chains of slavery;—

Resolved, That every person now held in slavery in the district of Columbia, and Territory of Florida, and of right ought to be, FREE, that all laws subjecting them to such a condition, are unconstitutional, null and void; and that all persons retaining them as slaves are guilty of the most high handed theft and robbery.

### PETITIONS.

Resolved, That to all who question the propriety and expediency of our continuing to petition Congress on the subject of slavery, inasmuch as our petitions are treated only with contempt, this is our answer: First, our petitions agitate the whole nation, and expose the sin of slave holding, and to see and feel this sin clearly and deeply, is all that is necessary to rouse the good people of the United States from a long lethargy, to an exterminating crusade against the whole system. Second, petition is the only mode of access which the women of this country have to Congress, and to shut them out from this door, is to blot them out of a civil existence. Third, petition is the only way opened by the Constitution, to obtain a redress of grievances, and can never be abandoned till we are prepared to become slaves ourselves. Fourth, it is an unerring index to our Representatives of the feelings and wishes of their constituents, sustaining them amidst the poisonous atmosphere of slavery, to stand by the rights of man and vote for emancipation. Fifth, it encourages ourselves to press onward, by showing us, every year, the vast number and increase of our coadjutors, who are engaged in the same holy cause. Sixth, it has already done much, if not every thing, to keep Texas out of this nation; thus far, for the first time, having defeated the slave-holding interest in our government, confined slavery within its previous limits, and shown that when the nation shall have once been united in abolition, as it did on this measure, slavery must be overthrown.

### TEXAS.

The question of the annexation of Texas has been recently agitating Congress. It will be seen from the reports published below, that there are three parties in the House;—one, wishing to settle the question at once by taking measures for the annexation of Texas; another desirous of obtaining from the House an immediate and decided expression of hostility to the project, and a third party, non-committal in its measures, reluctant to adopt any decided course of action, afraid to commit themselves against the annexation, lest they should offend the South; or in favor of it, lest they should displease the North. A majority of this class, is probably apprehensive that pushing the matter just now to a crisis, would interfere with some party-object.

### IN THE SENATE, MR. PRESTON'S RESOLUTION HAS BEEN, WE TRUST, INDEFINITELY POSTPONED.

### ANNEXATION OF TEXAS.

On motion of Mr. PRESTON the Senate took up the joint resolution offered by him to annex Texas to the United States.

Mr. SOUTHWARD, remarking on the number of Senators absent, and the importance of the measure proposed, moved to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. PRESTON inquired if this was designed to be a final position in regard to the resolution.

Mr. SOUTHWARD replied that he could speak only for himself; but, as far as he was concerned, it was designed to be final, as he should not vote for again taking it up at this session; but he temporarily withdrew the motion at the request of Mr. CALHOUN.

Mr. CALHOUN, who objected to that part of the preamble which declares that a portion of the United States territory was surrendered by the treaty with Spain; but spoke strongly in favor of the main object of the resolution, and expressed the hope that if the resolution were now laid on the table, it would shortly again be called up.

After a brief discussion, Mr. PRESTON, LUMPKIN, CALHOUN, and SOUTHWARD, all moved to lay the resolution on the table, which was done.

Mr. SOUTHWARD, having, in the course of the conversation, a second time made and thrown his motion to lay the resolution on the table, declared, in a spirit of courtesy, that he should not again renew it; whereupon.

Mr. NORVELL renewed the motion to lay the resolution on the table; which motion was carried in the affirmative vote, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allen, Bayard, Brown, Buchanan, Clay, of Ken., Clayton, Davis, Hubbard, King, Knight, Lyon, McKean, Nicholas, Niles, Norvell, Pierce, Ransom, Robinson, Southard, Wall, Webster, Williams, Wright, Young—24.

YEAS—Messrs. Benton, Calhoun, Cuthbert, Fulton, Grundy, Linn, Lumpkin, Mason, Preston, Rives, Sevier, Strang, Trotter, White—14.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, June 13

[Abridged from the National Intelligencer]

### ANNEXATION OF TEXAS.

Mr. DROMGOOLE, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported, that there is now no proposition pending in this House either for the admission of the Republic of Texas as a State into the Union, or for its territorial annexation to the United States.

The committee do not deem it advisable to recommend any action on the part of the House in relation to the subject, until the question of the propriety of the annexation of Texas to the United States, shall have been decided by the House.

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the subject, and that all the papers relating thereto, and to them referred, be laid on the table.

Mr. CUSHING called for a division of the question, so that it might be first taken upon that part of the report which proposed to discharge the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. C. discharged the report, and should, before he laid on the table, a resolution, for the purpose of having the subject more deliberately and argumentatively presented to the House. It was due to the country and the subject.

The preamble says there is no proposition before the House for the annexation of Texas to the United States. This might be technically, in strict parliamentary language, correct; since there was no motion pending in the House for the annexation of Texas.

But Mr. C. denied that this was, in substance, correct. Three States of this Union, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, have passed resolutions for the admission of Texas to the Union; and of two at least of these States, the resolutions have been passed by a large majority of the House. In addition to which, Texas herself has applied to the United States for admission. This proposition was pending now, and in force; and not, as the late report of the Secretary of State would seem to intimate, withdrawn from the cognizance of the Government. By the very latest intelligence from Texas, the Secretary of State had distinctly refused to withdraw the application.

Now, some gentlemen might think that this application was withdrawn from the cognizance of the Executive only, as in the first instance. Mr. C. maintained the contrary most positively. Congress, the House, the People of the United States, were under no obligation to wait in such a matter for the initiative of the President in regard to it. We, the Representatives of the People, have the same power, and right as the President to act upon it in the initiative. He might not be disposed to do right. It was the duty of the House to see to the interests and the rights of the People upon this vital question. The Constitution does not give to the Executive any power to limit new States. It is for Congress to do it, so far as the power lies.

So far as the power lies, let Congress do it, and let the House, speak and speak out, in the face of the country and world.

Furthermore, Three of the States, Ohio, Michigan, and Massachusetts, have sent here resolutions solemnly remonstrating against the annexation of Texas. It is due to those States, also, to express our opinions frankly on the subject. It was due to the thousands upon thousands of petitioners, whose petitions on this subject laid the table, to express our opinions. They ask it, they demand it, they have a right to do it. How long is this House to fold its arms in the mantle of its dignity, covering itself up in darkness, refusing to utter its opinions, suppressing opinions and debates, disclaiming, as it were, to meet the People fairly in the light of day, manfully and honestly, as becomes their Representatives? Mr. C. insisted upon the duty of the committee to make a full, argumentative report. He would not undertake to discuss the merits of the question. He was conscious it would be out of order, and he had no disposition, on this or any other question, to debate out of order. But he desired to see a report, and therefore he submitted the following motion:

That the report be committed to the same committee, with instructions to make report thereon in full as to the merits of the questions presented by the resolutions of the

Legislatures of the several States of Tennessee, Alabama, Michigan, Ohio, and Massachusetts, and of the various petitions before the House on the subject of Texas.

Mr. CARTER, of Tennessee, said he differed entirely from the gentleman from Massachusetts as to this subject. Although (Mr. CARTER'S) own State Legislature had passed a resolution in favor of the annexation of Texas, and although in this House had gone to show that his opinion did not correspond precisely with those of his Legislature upon this point. He doubted the expediency of annexing Texas to the Union.

### TEXAS.

The House then resumed the unfinished business of yesterday morning.

And the question being on the following resolution, reported yesterday by Mr. DROMGOOLE, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the whole subject, and that all the papers relating thereto, and to them referred, be laid on the table."

And on the amendment thereto by Mr. CUSHING, Mr. HOWARD rose, but yielded the floor at the request of Mr. W. THOMPSON, who moved to amend the amendment as follows:

Stick to the "instructions," and insert: "To report a joint resolution directing the President to take the proper steps for the annexation of Texas to the United States, as soon as it can be done consistently with the treaty stipulations of this Government."

Mr. HOWARD said that he regretted that the proposition of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CUSHING) had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.

Mr. HOWARD said that he had been surprised to find that the House had not been sustained yesterday by the House. He could not anticipate a single good result from the prolongation of a general debate upon the subject of Texas, but, on the contrary, many evils, even greater than the useless consumption of valuable time. As the vote of the House, however, had been against the proposition, he had risen yesterday to vindicate as far as he could, the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the implied charge of failure to perform a duty entrusted to them by the House. The amendment now offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) gives to the question an entirely new aspect, and he would be compelled to digress from what he had in his mind, and will say a few words in relation to the new aspect of the question.



